

### **REMARKS**

The claims have not been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 10, 20, and 21 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

#### ***Claim Objection***

In the Office Action, claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 have not been amended because Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 depend from allowable base claims and are allowable at least for this reason.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-18, and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0201716 applied for by Yamazaki, *et al.* ("Yamazaki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Yamazaki fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a second pixel electrode located on the first pixel electrode and contacting at least an upper surface and a side surface of the first pixel electrode, wherein the side surface of the first pixel electrode has a taper.

Yamazaki fails to disclose at least these limitations. The Examiner states, "Yamazaki discloses (see figure 2b) an organic EL device including a substrate (30), a third pixel electrode (36b), a first pixel electrode (36c), and a second pixel electrode (36d)." See page 2 of Office Action. The Examiner then goes on to assert, "Side surfaces of all three electrodes are tapered and the above electrode further covers the side surface of the below electrode (see figure 2b)." See page 2 of Office Action. This assertion is clearly incorrect. None of the third pixel electrode (36b), first pixel electrode (36c), or second pixel electrode (36d) have a tapered side surface, as clearly shown in Figure 2B of Yamazaki. It is also clear from Figure 2B of Yamazaki that none of the electrodes 36b, 36c, or 36d contact the tapered side surface of another electrode.

It is further noted that electrode 36f does not contact a tapered side surface of electrode 36e (see Figures 2B and 3B and paragraph [0132]). Therefore, Yamzaki fails to disclose a second pixel electrode located on the first pixel electrode and contacting at least an upper surface and a side surface of the first pixel electrode, wherein the side surface of the first pixel electrode has a taper.

Independent claim 20 recites "a first pixel electrode located in a predetermined area on the substrate, where the first pixel electrode has a side surface tapered toward an upper part thereof; a second pixel electrode located on the first pixel electrode and contacting at least an upper surface and the side surface of the first pixel electrode." Yamazaki fails to disclose at least this limitation of claim 20.

Similarly, claim 10 recites "forming a second pixel electrode on the first pixel electrode to contact at least an upper surface and a side surface of the first pixel electrode, wherein the side

surface of the first pixel electrode is formed to have a taper" and claim 21 recites "forming a first pixel electrode in a predetermined area on the substrate, where the first pixel electrode is formed to have a side surface tapered toward an upper part thereof; forming a second pixel electrode on the first pixel electrode to contact at least an upper surface and the side surface of the first pixel electrode." Yamazaki fails to disclose at least these limitations of claims 10 and 21.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 10, 20, and 21. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 11-14, and 16-18 depend from claims 1 and 10 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 10, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 have not been amended because Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 depend from allowable base claims and are allowable at least for this reason.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 5, 9, 15, and 19 are in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 11, 2007

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP:SLK/kbs